

REMARKS

Administrative Overview

Claims 1-27 remain pending in this application and are presented for reconsideration. Claims 1, 6, 19, and 23 are amended without any intent of disclaiming equivalents thereof.

Support for amendments to claims 1, 6, 19, and 23 can be found throughout the Specification, for example, at FIGS. 1, 3, and 4 and paragraphs [0031], [0036], [0037], and [0038]. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

In the Office action mailed on May 9, 2005, claims 11-13 and 25-27 were allowed, and claim 16 was objected to as being dependant upon a rejected base claim. Applicants respectfully believe claim 14 to be allowable, as it depends directly from allowed independent claim 11.

Claims 1-2, 5-9, 17-19, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,553,801 to Lee (“Lee”), claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by either U.S. Patent No. 6,387,214 to Kustermann et al (“Kustermann”) or U.S. Patent No. 6,212,960 to Durand-Texte et al (“Durand-Texte”), and claims 1-2, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. to Mucke et al (“Mucke”).

Further, claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Kustermann or Durand-Texte, claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mucke, claims 3-4, 10, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, and claims 6, 9-10, and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Lee.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-10, 14-15, and 17-24 and request reconsideration of these claims.

Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 5-9, 17-19, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Lee. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 6, 19, and 23 to recite “a *plurality* of exposed sensors.” Lee, by contrast, does not teach or suggest a plurality of sensors. Rather, Lee teaches a single “piezoelectric material layer” that is coated onto a guide pole as a thin film, resulting in a single film of material that covers all or part of a guide pole, as indicated, for example, in Lee’s Figure 2 (reference 20) and at column 2, lines 29 to 59 (“the *entire*

circumference of the guide pole 30 is shown to be *coated* with said material 20.” [Emphasis added.]). Therefore, in light of the foregoing claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 6, 19, and 23 and their dependents are patentable over Lee.

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by either Kustermann or Durand-Texte. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite “a plurality of *exposed* sensors affixed to or implanted within the circumferential surface.” Durand-Texte and Kustermann, by contrast, do not teach or suggest establishing a plurality of *exposed* sensors. Rather, Kustermann teaches a multitude of sensors placed underneath a cover layer of a rotating roll. See, e.g., column 8, lines 53 to 57 of Kustermann (“This arrangement offers the advantage of trouble free treating, particularly when the sensors are *located underneath a protective cover layer.*” [Emphasis added.])

Durand-Texte teaches a series of sensors placed internally within a measuring roller, and not affixed to or implanted within the circumferential surface, as indicated, for example, in Durand-Texte’s Figure 1 (reference 13) and at column 3, lines 57 to 58 (“This flattening is measured by a series of sensors 13 (13i) preferably *placed inside* the set of rings 10.” [Emphasis added.]). Therefore, in light of the foregoing claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 and its dependents are patentable over Kustermann and Durand-Texte.

Claims 1-2, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Mucke. Mucke also does not teach a plurality of *exposed* sensors as required by amended claim 1. Rather, Mucke teaches a number of sensors imbedded within recesses with a separate sensor cover covering each sensor, wherein the sensor cover can move within the recess, as indicated, for example, in Mucke’s Figure 3 (reference 3) and at column 3, lines 52 to 54 (“...a sensor cover 3 positioned within the recess 2 so as to *cover* the stress-responsive sensor 1.” [Emphasis added.]). Therefore, in light of the foregoing claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 and its dependents are patentable over Mucke.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 5-9, 17-19, 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The remaining rejections relate only to dependent claims, which we respectfully submit are patentable in light of the amendments discussed above. None of the references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the use of a plurality of exposed sensors.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection and objection, and allowance of claims 1-27 in due course. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative by telephone at the number listed below to discuss any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven J. Frank
Attorney for the Applicants
Goodwin Procter LLP
Exchange Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Goodwin Customer No. 051414

Date: June 7, 2005
Reg. No. 33,497

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1241
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231

LIBA/1536297.1